The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare

Volume 39
Issue 3 *September*

Article 7

September 2012

Capacity Building Legacies: Boards of the Richmond Male Orphan Asylum for Destitute Boys & the Protestant Episcopal Church Home for Infirm Ladies 1870-1900

F. Ellen Netting
Virginia Commonwealth University

Mary Katherine O'Connor
Virginia Commonwealth University

David P. Fauri
Virginia Commonwealth University

Capacity Building Legacies: Boards of the Richmond Male Orphan Asylum for Destitute Boys & the Protestant Episcopal Church Home for Infirm Ladies 1870-1900

F. Ellen Netting

Mary Katherine O'Connor

David P. Fauri

Virginia Commonwealth University
School of Social Work

What strategies did early boards of managers of charitable human service agencies pursue to build capacity in a way that sustained their efforts for more than a hundred years? Using primary and secondary documents to focus on two organizations—The Male Orphan Asylum (1846) and the Protestant Episcopal Church Home (1875)—three norms emerged: run it like a business, keep it like a house, and base it in the community, along with a host of associated activities. Based on these norms and activities, three strategies were identified: diversification of resources, working boards, and leadership continuity, all of which have implications for building capacity for sustainability in contemporary community-based human service agencies.

Key words: *boards, charity, human service organizations, social welfare history, sustainability*

Only time tells if a charitable organization will have continued success in its role as service provider, and organizational stakeholders must live a long time to see if their efforts produce a sustainable endeavor. With this in mind, we studied the deep history of two small to mid-sized centenarian charitable organizations that have stood the test of time in one southeastern United States city. We hoped to discover the strategies their early boards pursued to build capacity, assuming their

foundational norms, activities and strategies would provide indications about how their efforts led to sustained service delivery work for more than a hundred years. We looked for lessons relevant to contemporary social service sustainability that could be drawn from these early capacity building efforts.

The Richmond Male Orphan Asylum

It has been said that on the day after Thanksgiving in 1845 a young, homeless boy came begging for food at the doorstep of the asylum run by the Female Humane Association, one of Richmond's few orphanages (Barber, 1999). Frustrated that the asylum only served homeless girls, the director encouraged her husband and other benevolent male colleagues to consider establishing an orphan society for destitute boys (Rogers, 1956). On May 16, 1846 the first meeting of a six-member board of managers of The Richmond Male Orphan Society was held in a local church. That same year, the Society was chartered by The General Assembly of Virginia, and the Richmond Male Orphan Asylum opened for business.

Available minutes of the Asylum's board of managers begin in January 1870. In 1876 the Society revised its charter with the General Assembly, and its stated purpose became "the relief of distressed males and the support and education of destitute children" with powers "to bind out such poor children ... the indentures of apprenticeship to be executed by the Trustees ... on behalf of the Society" (RMOA, 1876, p. 66). The charter further specified that the father, or the mother (if there was no father) could request that a child be placed in the Asylum. Often destitute parents would relinquish a child to the Asylum and these children were referred to as half orphans. In this situation, the records reveal that the parent could petition to have the child returned to them should their circumstances change their ability to take care of the child. If the child was deserted by both parents or orphaned, then it would be up to the overseer of the poor or a member of the overseer's board to relinquish him in writing to the Asylum.

The Protestant Episcopal Church Home

The proliferation of private charities transcended generations, and as orphanages were attempting to address the needs of destitute children, old age homes were being established by various religious groups to care for the older generation. In February 1875, the Protestant Episcopal Church Home (PECH) was established as a "Home for Ladies in reduced circumstances who have seen better days" (PECH LB, 1875, p. 1). With this establishment came the appointment of a 16-member lady board of managers, with Mrs. Emily Whittle as President and Mrs. Elizabeth H. Peterkin as First Vice President, both wives of Episcopal clergymen serving churches within the city. Just as Dr. W. W. Parker (long-time Board President of the Asylum) was involved in multiple charities, so were Mrs. Whittle and Mrs. Peterkin. Richmond City Directories reveal that Mrs. Whittle was also the first president of the YWCA in Richmond (1887).

On March 25, 1875 the General Assembly of Virginia granted a charter to the Church Home. In this charter was named an all-male, eight member board of corporators. At their first meeting on April 20, 1875, Episcopal Bishop F. M. Whittle was called to chair and Reverend Peterkin appointed as Secretary. The charter granted the incorporators the power to adopt a Constitution and bylaws, and:

> to delegate their powers to a board of managers ... sixteen ladies to whom shall be entrusted the entire management of the 'Home' under such rules and regulations as they may adopt subject only to the provisions of the Constitution. They shall elect their own officers, and fill by ballot any vacancies in their own body occurring during the year and they shall continue in office until their successors shall be elected. (PECH LB, 1875, p. 2)

Setting the Context

The Richmond Male Orphan Asylum (hereinafter referred to as the Orphan Asylum) and the Protestant Episcopal Church Home (hereinafter referred to as the Church Home) were both chartered by the General Assembly, and both have survived

well over a century. Today the Orphan Asylum is the Virginia Home for Boys and Girls, having established its domain in 1975 as statewide and having added "girls" to its clientele in the last decade. During the 1970s the Church Home joined "with the Diocesan Home and Presbyterian Home to be built and known as Westminster-Canterbury Home," (PECH LB, 1971, p. 51) a large continuing care retirement community now serving both men and women from Richmond and Central Virginia. Both became highly successful organizations and still serve within greatly expanded domains and contemporary contexts. These two organizations are useful exemplars because they served different populations (destitute male children, and aged and infirm ladies), and the composition of their boards of managers provide a unique comparative view on gender roles and decision-making in charitable organizations from 1870-1900 (Netting & O'Connor, 2005). Both have been operated continuously since their founding, and each assumes a different structural form today. Their early capacity building strategies form the basis of this paper.

Contextually, charitable health and human service organizations proliferated in Richmond during the late 1800s, spurred by religious motivations and these were often led by women. A number of feminist historians have explored how gendered roles permeated the governance and management of charitable agencies (e.g., Ginzberg, 1990; Gordon, 1991; Green, 2003; McCarthy, 1982, 1990, 2003; Scott, 1970, 1993). Early human service organizations in Central Virginia have been studied by a number of historians who have discovered the magnitude of the benevolent work performed by Virginia's early women (e.g., Barber, 1999; Click, 1989; Green, 2003, 2005; Hamburger, 1999; Lebsock, 1984; Treadway, 1995; Varon, 1998). Civic housekeeping emerged as a public form of moral guardianship, in which women expanded their roles from sewing circles, religious groups, mite societies (from the Biblical expression "widow's mite"), and clubs to address the charitable needs of poor women and children in their communities (Skocpol, 1992). Thus, the role of women as "lady managers" was unearthed by a number of historians, as until recently the historical concept of "lady boards of managers" (Netting & O'Connor, 2005) had been forgotten (Becker, 1987).

A number of small to mid-sized centenarian private health and human service organizations in Richmond have stood the test of time and have deep continuous roots in previous centuries (Netting, O'Connor, & Fauri, 2009). In this study, we selected two agencies with the most comprehensive early documentation available in the archives of the Virginia Historical Society. Their histories were meticulously documented by early managers who kept minutes and wrote annual reports about how they built the capacity of their charities to survive through economic downturns and hard times and to sustain themselves into the 20th century. Records kept by these boards reveal a great deal that, left uninterrogated, would be lost in understanding these private charitable organizations in regard to policy-making and decision-making processes used by their early boards of managers. Board members' activities cohered into norms that allowed them to endure within the context of Richmond. Not only did these boards govern and legitimize their organizations, but they oversaw missions and supervised the use of resources. Thus, the narrative left by the board is a form of primary documentation that "works to establish identity ... [and] is central to transmission of the past" (Linde, 2009, p. 4).

The Orphan Asylum had an all-male board of managers, and the Church Home had a lady board of managers and an all-male board of corporators. These boards comprised the governing and decision-making bodies for these organizations, and kept comprehensive collections of board minutes, annual reports, and correspondence. Primary sources of original documents were supplemented with secondary sources such as newpaper accounts and agency histories (Danto, 2008). Minute books and early correspondence are well preserved and available at The Virginia Historical Society (VHS) and these collections provide comprehensive and rich sources of data. We used these primary documents to ask: What strategies did these early boards of managers pursue to build capacity in a way that sustained their efforts for more than a hundred years? Are there lessons that can be learned from these early capacity building efforts?

Norms and Activities

Norms are those deeply embedded, overriding behavioral guidelines or expectations that drive decision-making and behavior. In minutes and reports three norms emerged: run it like a business; keep it like a house; and base it in the community. Using these norms as a guide, examples of activities associated with them are incorporated into the narrative below. Activities are tactical approaches that appeared to contribute to sustaining each norm.

Run it Like a Business

The Orphan Asylum's board of managers and the Church Home's board of corporators were all male. There was a clear separation by gender in both organizations, which was typical for agencies in Richmond in the late 1800s. Central to these male boards was a serious focus on property, legal, and business concerns conducted in the context of the time in order for the charitable enterprise to succeed. The activities that aligned with the norm of running it like a business were: focusing on long term investment and prescribing governance.

Focusing on long-term investment. Male boards in both organizations were particularly focused on institutionalizing long-term investment opportunities. They paid close attention to making money through real estate and loans. Issues surrounding real estate taxes precipitated seeking counsel.

The Orphan Asylum's board bought and sold both real estate and stocks/bonds (especially for railroads), as well as received rent as primary sources of income. Dialogue about real estate, bonds, stocks, rental properties, and various investment strategies was found throughout the Orphan Asylum's minutes. The board engaged in a variety of long-range fundraising strategies. They received public subsidies of $90 per year when a child was moved from the City Alms House to their Asylum (RMOA, 1870, p. 1). When expected donations and subscriptions were slow, they employed "a suitable collector to be sent out at once to solicit contributions from the citizens generally ..." (RMOA, 1876, p. 68). Employment of the boys in community businesses or nearby farms was a funding source at the Asylum and became a major focus of the board in

the 1870s. After "the President read a paper suggesting the employment of the boys part of the time in making match boxes or in other mechanical labor" (RMOA, 1875, p. 58), the Asylum established a cigar factory. The President, in his annual report, envisioned: "a well managed State Orphan Asylum for boys where instruction in letters and cigar making, or some other industry, were combined might be made largely self-sustaining" (RMOA, 1885, p. 140). When the cigars suffered competition from the manufacture of cheroots and cigarettes, the board considered establishing a cigarette factory of their own using 100 boys.

The Church Home's board of corporators met once a year (except for called meetings). It elected a 16 member lady board of managers to whom was entrusted the Home's management. Like the Orphan Asylum's board, the Church Home's male corporators focused on the business aspects of the Home. They amended the Constitution as needed, adopted bylaws, and then established the duty of the Treasurer on their behalf to handle "all entrance fee donations, bequests, and other funds. Of these funds, the Corporators shall set apart whatever may be described as a permanent endowment fund, the remainder shall be invested or used ... for the benefit of the institution" (PECH BoC, 1879, p. 14). Considerable effort was expended attending to legalities and responsibilities associated with legacies, complexities of dealing with heirs, investing in bonds, and the value of stocks. By 1899 there was increasing dialogue about the pros and cons of legacies and property left to the Church Home.

The Church Home's lady board marketed their organization through regional and local papers. In meetings, donations were acknowledged from other cities and states, and were targeted to the Church Home's endowment fund. For example, when Mrs. James R. Werth sent money collected from friends and family to name a room after her Aunt, the lady board struck upon a new way to raise endowment funds. The idea of "naming" became part of an ongoing fundraising effort and continued well into the next century as part of their institutional fundraising drives. Today it is a standard practice in institutional fund-raising.

Prescribing governance. The Orphan Asylum's board was

composed of business and professional men, and a physician (W. W. Parker) served as President from before 1870 to 1899 (the year of his death). They ran their agency like a business. In September 1886 the Orphan Asylum's board approved a new charter, constitution and bylaws, and a revised structure for indenturing the boys. Standing committees were designated as Education and Discipline, Admission and Dismissal, Indenture, and the Industrial School (RMOA, 1887, p. 218), reflecting specialization and a clear division of labor, concepts that emerged later in the soon to surface (1890s-1910s) scientific management movement. Subsequent minutes reflected careful attention to rotating committee membership over the years so that board members experienced all aspects of the Asylum, to the point that they rebuked the President whenever a decision on an issue was made that in their view should have first gone to a committee. There was an effort for strict adherence to their established structure, creating a balance of power within the agency.

The Church Home's board of corporators was composed primarily of clergymen and lawyers. They ran their annual board meetings with precision, closely following a standard agenda with formal rules of order. They amended their bylaws as needed and were explicit in prescribing board structure. For the organization's lady board, for example, a specific number of members had to come from area churches, "at least two members from each [Episcopal] church that has been or may be connected with the institution" (PECH BoC, 1878, p. 13). They approved all reports and rigorously followed an established order of business.

The Church Home's lady board of managers also listed an order of business in their bylaws. At times having a quorum present at meetings was problematic and caused considerable frustration. At one point in 1875 the frustration appeared in the wording of the minutes—missing four meetings in a row without "good cause" meant that "her place on the board [will] be considered vacant" (PECH LB, 1875, p. 12). This became policy. In 1876 the minutes of the Church Home's board of corporators listed an almost identical order. Earlier, in 1886 the Orphan Asylum's board had dropped two members from the board for nonattendance

Keep it Like a House

With no lady board at the Orphan Asylum, the men engaged in discussions about inmate behavior but relied heavily upon the Superintendent, staff, or ladies from the community to deal with daily operations. Just as male board members practiced what they knew best in their professional roles, lady boards brought skills of running households to the Church Home. Thus, the "keep it like a house" norm was typically carried out by women with related activities being making and enforcing house rules, managing budget and supervising staff, and visiting inmates.

Making and enforcing house rules. The Orphan Asylum had explicit rules, but of a different nature from the Church Home, given their young charges. When the boys were invited to attend an Episcopal mission school on Sunday afternoon, for example, the board graciously declined the invitation, saying that the boys should be taught at the Orphan Asylum instead. The following year The President reported that "the frequent escape of boys from the Asylum [had grown] out of the fact that children were allowed to scatter on Sundays and in small squads attend different churches and Sunday Schools without anyone in charge of them." A resolution was adopted by the board that "the boys under the charge of the Superintendent should be made to attend one Sunday School and Church" (RMOA, 1872, p. 28).

Appended to the bylaws, the Church Home's lady board developed a set of eight "regulations" designed to regularize Home management. The result was control of inmate behavior. No furniture was to be brought into the Home without board approval; meal times were to be standardized; consent was required to visit the kitchen; complaints had to be directed to the board, not the Superintendent; rooms needed to be kept neat; inmates with a source of income had to contribute to the Home's maintenance; lights had to be out at 11:00; and no visitors could be received before noon (PECH LB, 1875, pp. 6-7). Regulations were expanded in the course of experience.

Managing budget and overseeing staff. The Orphan Asylum constantly struggled with the dilemma of keeping the number of boys to a manageable level, given the funds available. Over the years, the board often put a hold on admissions "that no

more boys be received by the Asylum until the income of the Society should be increased to an extent sufficient to justify it" (RMOA, 1876, p. 68). The President explained the dilemma of restricting admissions.

> It was very difficult to carry [this restriction] because I met with some cases of such absolute destitution that I could only have sent the boys to the almshouse, from whence they would have been sent to us, as we have agreed with the Council of the City to take all boys they might send us in consideration of the city appropriation to our support" (RMOA, 1877, p. 72).

Here one sees the interconnections between resources and acquiring new clients.

Both the Church Home and the Orphan Asylum had Superintendents who received an operating budget and were expected to manage it and report to their respective board of managers. Without a lady board, the Orphan Asylum relied for some period upon Mrs. Gill, who was referred to as "the energetic and sensible wife of our Superintendent." Subsequently, when Mrs. Gill replaced her deceased spouse as Superintendent at the Asylum, she provided a complete accounting of household expenses in her first annual report, explaining how the garden had produced more than expected and how they had sold produce. Cows provided milk. No clothing had been brought, and only the larger boys wore shoes during the summer. She then carefully itemized the personnel expenses, including the Superintendent, Teacher, Manager of the Cigar Factory, Gardener, Matron, Housekeeper, Cook, Washer, Ironer, and House Servant, along with provisions, clothing, coal, and serving costs (RMOA, 1885, p. 188). A reading of the Asylum's minutes for the period suggests a competent, albeit untrained, institutional manager.

In the early 1870s President Parker, of the Orphan Asylum board of managers, indicated that he had received reports of mismanagement in the Asylum and he requested that three ladies visit the Asylum once a month for the purpose of examining the management" (RMOA, 1871, p. 12). Since the Orphan Asylum did not have a lady board, its male board called upon ladies from the community to help out in overseeing

operations. Two years later, when the board expressed concern over the appearance of the boys and the grounds, they employed "a reliable white woman to aid in keeping the boys and premises clean" (RMOA, 1873, p. 40).

At the Church Home, "servants" were hired to perform specific duties such as cooking, cleaning, and property maintenance. The oversight of what happened at the Home appeared to be more intense, as the lady board attended to housekeeping details that did not come up in male board meetings unless they involved costly repairs.

Visiting the inmates. It was not until October 8, 1877 that the Orphan Asylum board mentioned "a regulation requiring the appointment of a committee of visitation and supervision for the Asylum" (RMOA, 1887, p. 75). The board then resolved to appoint a committee of three board members to visit and report back. The committee did some visiting, but months went by when they did not manage to perform their duties. Unlike the lady board of the Church Home, the Orphan Asylum's male visitors did not appear to be required to meet a standard for frequency of visitation and the board at times delegated these types of interactions to community women.

From the beginning, the Church Home's lady board appointed a monthly visiting committee, typically having two ladies visiting each week. Visiting committees unable to visit the Church Home for the week appointed substitutes. To engage others in the life of the Church Home the board resolved "that any visiting committee can invite the attendance of a Lady outside of the board of managers to accompany said committee in its appointed weekly visit to the Home" (PECH LB, 1875, p. 11). Here the norm of "basing it in the community" is reflected. Several meetings later, the board resolved "that young ladies from all the churches be invited to visit the Home from time to time in a social way to cheer and brighten the otherwise monotonous life of the residents" (PECH LB, 1876, p. 20).

When the Church Home had been operating for about seven years, the lady board became more and more focused on issues faced by residents as they aged. A resident fell, broke her thigh, and the physicians thought they could never set the broken bone without "necessitating much suffering on her part

and very much expense to the Home." A few months later, two lady visitors discovered a very sick resident with whom they stayed until she died. Although minutes offered limited detail concerning illness or injury, there appeared to be concerns that residents were dying because staff did not know what to do when faced with these situations. By the late 1890s, the ladies had hired a student nurse to help them out. Given the nature of the Church Home's clientele, discharge typically occurred as a result of the inmate dying.

Base it in the Community

The Church Home and the Orphan Asylum arose from the local community, and they were closely tied to the citizenry. Both organizations represented different but related approaches to being what in today's language would be called community-based and faith-based. Two activities within the norm of basing it in the community were identified—soliciting resources and identifying with Christian values.

Soliciting resources. Both monetary and in-kind contributions were constantly being solicited from the local community by the two organizations. Mrs. Gill, as Superintendent of the Orphan Asylum, came up with the idea of raising money "by the sale of Bricks. ... The children by hundreds have been engaged in 'selling bricks' and thus raising money and identifying themselves with this charity" (RMOA, 1884, p. 170). Mrs. Gill proposed other fundraising ideas such as holding a "donation party" and was compensated that same year as the "solicitor collector ... to procure annual and contributing members" (1884-1885, pp. 178-181). In 1885 there were several references to the "Ladies Bazaar."

In a slightly different way, with its board of lady managers, the Church Home periodically opened its doors to the public and held a "pounding" through which they invited community members to make donations by bringing a pound of food or similar household items that could be used as an in-kind contribution to the cause. This annual "pounding" netted in-kind supplies for the winter, everything from flour and potatoes to cups and saucers. In another effort to generate revenue, life memberships were created in 1876 by the Church Home's lady board at $25.00 each. "This seemed to go toward the

endowment fund. The object of this was not to abridge the annual giving, but to show who are, and have been friends of the Home" (PECH LB, 1876, p. 29). This approach supplemented the ongoing collection of subscriptions that were a part of this organization from its beginning.

The relationship of resource needs and Christian values is reflected in board appeals to the religious community, and they were not above using guilt as a motivator. Annual reports of the Orphan Asylum referred to the moral responsibility of good Christian people to support the cause. "I felt almost ashamed last year to report only $404 contributed by all the citizens of this Christian city" (RMOA, 1889, p. 255) lamented the Orphan Asylum's President. At the annual meetings of the Orphan Asylum, appeals to local clergy, congregational members, and any other Christian citizens were made. The President told the story of two orphan boys, one of whom died because he was so

> enfeebled by insufficient food when we received him that he never rallied. His brother, who was received year before last, lived but a short while after entering the Asylum. It is so sad to think of two orphans dying indirectly from famine within sound of so many Christian church-bells. (RMOA, 1877, p. 72)

Clergy comprised much of the Church Home's board of corporators, but beyond that their lady board members regularly appealed to clergy to solicit from their congregations.

Identifying with Christian values. Just as resources were solicited from the religious community, there were multiple other ways in which these organizations identified with Christian values. References to God and Christianity were evident in annual reports. Both organizations held annual meetings that were attended by local clergy, held in local churches, and at which offerings were taken. Not tied to one specific denomination, the Orphan Asylum's annual meeting was held at a different Protestant church every year with different clergy delivering a sermon. The history of the Orphan Asylum was repeated in annual reports as a reminder that the first meeting of the board was held in Reverend Dr. Stiles' Church on May 16, 1846 with references to "these Christian men, once so well

known in this city, [who] have gone to their reward ... they labored to help their fellow-man and honor God, but they are held in 'everlasting remembrance' in heaven" (RMOA, 1882, p. 172). This was in keeping with the religious revivalism of the later 19th century.

The Church Home was permeated with religious symbolism and was connected with the Episcopal Church. The very name of the corporation attested to its religiosity. The Orphan Asylum, on the other hand, was more ecumenically oriented but within the boundaries of Christianity. Board meetings of both organizations opened with prayers. Church Home regulations required blessings at each meal and daily family prayers. Provisions were made for the religious instruction of the boys at the Orphan Asylum every Sunday.

When board members died, Christian language was evident. For example, when a member of the Orphan Asylum board died, these words were recorded:

> It is much that those of us who remain should in commemoration of his past connections with [the Society] place upon its records a testimonial of his zeal for and fidelity to the cause of charity and of his virtues as the Christian gentleman. (RMOA, 1873, p. 34)

Similarly, the Recording Secretary of the Home's lady board died and the ladies wrote, "It only remains for us to bow in submission to the Divine will and to thank God for the good example of our much loved friend, who having finished her course in faith now rests from her labours" (PECH LB, 1876, p. 25).

The Church Home's lady board of managers and the board of corporators were so closely tied that members of each were members of the same family. Commitment, then, was not just to the institution but to one another in families as well as to a larger Episcopal faith community. The Bishop and various Episcopalian ministers dominated the Church Home's board of corporators. The corporators specified that the lady board must contain at least two members from each of the City's Episcopal Churches and that if a person moved to another church she would need to vacate her position if that left only one person from her former church on the board. Inmates were

required to be members of the Episcopal Church, and clergy provided references for applicants. The Constitution was revised by the corporators in January 1877 to indicate that all applicants had to reside in the Diocese of Virginia for one year preceding her application and be a member of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

Embedded in hundreds of pages of handwritten notes is evidence that these boards operated using their own life experience for guidance. These were competent citizens who between them knew three things well—how to run businesses, how to manage households, and how to base their activities in community-based religious values and beliefs. Thus, these records provided an opportunity to closely examine the activities of two charitable organizations and their decision-making processes.

Discussion of Capacity Building Strategies

In the previous section, we identified activities associated with norms related to agency coherence over time. Based on these findings, we identified three cross-cutting strategies that worked in the context of the times to build capacity: (1) diversification of resources; (2) working boards; and (3) leadership continuity.

Diversification of Resources

Given the division of labor by gender, running the business and keeping the house were tightly linked through the first strategy of resource diversification. The male boards were intent on fiscal oversight, financial networks, and the details of wisely investing for organizational growth and stability, and the female board demonstrated the ability to raise funds and garnered in-kind contributions in creative ways to support programs. Not surprisingly, the lady board's fundraising approaches were similar to what women had done for generations in their churches—holding bazaars, sponsoring poundings, asking for contributions to the cause, naming rooms for benefactors, selling bricks, and marketing through church magazines. This resource diversification strategy was also tied to basing it in the community, with particular emphasis upon a Christian community.

The fundraising and revenue-generating approaches used by these two organizations were as broad as those employed by contemporary human service agencies. The Orphan Asylum received public contracts for housing individual boys, forerunners of what today's human service providers call purchase-of-service contracts. Profit-making enterprises such as the Cigar Factory were forerunners of charitable organizations that have for-profit arms, called venturing or social enterprise today. Both solicited annual subscriptions, encouraged life-time memberships, and asked clergy to hold collection days for their causes at local congregations. The President of the Orphan Asylum's board used most every annual meeting to appeal to Christians to give more, and the faith-permeated Church Home was structured so that two ladies from each Episcopal Church would be on the board as ambassadors to the Episcopalian community with special responsibilities for raising funds from their congregations.

Working Boards

There were no professionally trained human service planners, managers, and administrators staffing these agencies. These professional roles came later in the development of American social service agencies. These roles and functions fell to the Church Home and Orphan Asylum volunteer boards. They were involved in every aspect of agency operation, a second major strategy that kept their organizations alive. Provisions were made to cover both running the business and keeping the house. The Church Home did this by gender division, which fit within the context of the times. The Church Home's lady board of managers demonstrated their abilities over and over again, with the board of corporators avoiding as much as possible anything focusing on household management or inmate care. The Orphan Asylum's board attempted to delegate daily oversight by calling upon the Superintendent's wife and ladies in the community to assume the housekeeping and supervision responsibilities.

These boards were "working boards," and they added community people as needed to be immersed in the planning, management, and administration of their charities. In contrast, boards today tend to be policy and oversight oriented.

These early boards knew that they were ultimately responsible for the organization's financial health, otherwise their agencies would not be sustained and care provided for inmates. In today's literature, concern is expressed for boards that do not embrace their role as fundraisers and for boards that are so separated from the workings of their organizations as to not understand their service delivery programs. There is no doubt that these early boards provided lessons to be learned about commitment, involvement, and pragmatism that could enhance current concepts about board functioning.

Leadership Continuity

A third strategy used by these agencies was ensuring leadership continuity. These boards engaged in a type of intergenerational nepotism. Even today, on the boards of some of Richmond's centenarian agencies are members who are in their family's fifth or higher generation of service. Presidents of boards served continuously in that capacity for decades. Particularly for the lady board, to socialize daughters and nieces to civic housekeeping roles, these young women were invited to come into the Church Home and volunteer time, and eventually some were transitioned into leadership positions on the board of lady managers. In the Orphan Asylum's male board it appears that socialization and generativity were based on bringing in close colleagues or friends who were viewed as Christian gentlemen, good businessmen, and good community citizens. A few times sons or male relatives were included. Today in similar circumstances we might refer to individuals who are well networked.

Socialized to a gender-based division of labor, the next generation was moved into leadership with an understanding of how running the business and keeping the house were uniquely gendered. Incubated in a community in which these organizations had grown and developed under the guidance of long-standing community leaders, new board recruits recognized structures and activities that were necessary to keep these charitable ventures alive and vital. For example, having a prescribed governance structure served to socialize new members to organizational norms, with violators who did not attend meetings potentially facing being vacated from their

seats. For the lady board, continuity within the programmatic aspects of the organizations was reinforced by the board's assuming supervising responsibility for services and for visiting the inmates. The deep ties with the local community, specifically the Protestant Christian community, also contributed to leadership continuity. These leadership ties may be relevant to understanding the concept of a faith-permeated organization today because the Church Home was a faith-permeated, sectarian organization characterized by an unmistakable Episcopal presence. The Orphan Asylum, on the other hand, was more of a faith-affiliated organization with Christian symbolism evident in meetings, annual reports, and daily practice, but it was pan-Christian rather than strictly denominationally oriented.

Conclusion

One writer identifies capacity building as developing "coherence [which] is grounded in an ethic of sustainability and meaning; coherent institutions are exactly those that endure over time" (Lejano, 2006, p. 206). The boards of the Orphan Asylum and the Church Home built and sustained two seasoned, charitable human service organizations in Richmond. In historical context, their approaches to social agency governance and management made these charitable organizations viable through a combination of business and caring norms within a shared community, and a faith-based tradition that provided coherence. This was facilitated by a clear division of labor according to gender, well established and reinforced within the context of the times. Men ran the business and women kept the house. These two norms coincided with a community in which men and women were raised to do charitable works as part of their religious expression. They worked in parallel and respected the division of labor. When running the business or keeping the house became problematic or contentious, a binding force was the recognition of a calling on the part of these men and women to do charitable works. Had the motivation simply been to run a business or keep a house, there would have been plenty of times in the history of these organizations to throw up proverbial hands and call it quits.

Deep roots established by these organizations helped hold them together during trying times.

Unencumbered and unshaped by a proliferation of helping professionals who would later arise with the coming of the Progressive Era, these boards were managers in every sense of the word. We can now see the absence of professional agency staff as critical to the lady board of managers of the Church Home (as well as its male board of corporators) and the Orphan Asylum's male board of managers developing the capacity to perform charitable works and establish agencies that have done so for over one hundred years. There were no professional development officers or CEOs. Likewise, if they had not overseen the untrained staff who were there to deal with intimate details of inmate life, no one would have, because there were no trained supervisors to do this. They did what they knew to do from their life experiences and their socialization to civic life. By the mid-1900s, things changed as trained human service professionals gradually became available and were hired, and the division of labor became less gender-specific. Future research that follows these agencies into the 20th century may reveal additional insights about the changes that accompanied professionalization.

Acknowledgements: We are indebted to the archivists at the Virginia Historical Society who assisted us in locating documents, encouraged our efforts, and warmly greeted us as we spent days in the Reading Room.

References

Barber, E. S. (1999). Anxious care and constant struggle: The Female Humane Association and Richmond's white Civil War orphans, in E. C. Green (Ed.), *Before the New Deal: Social welfare in the South 1830-1930* (pp. 120-137). Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Becker, D. G. (June 1987). Isabella Graham and Joanna Bethune: Trailblazers of organized women's benevolence. *Social Service Review, 61*(2), 519-533.

Click, P. C. (1989). *The spirit of the times: Amusements in nineteenth-century Baltimore, Norfolk, and Richmond.* Charlottesville, VA: The University Press of Virginia.

Danto, E. A. (2008). *Historical research.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Ginzberg, L. D. (1990). *Women and the work of benevolence: Morality, politics, and class in the 19th century United States.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Gordon, L. (1991). Black and white visions of welfare: Women's welfare activism, 1890-1945. *Journal of American History, 78,* 559-590.

Green, E. C. (2003). *This business of relief: Confronting poverty in a southern city, 1740-1940.* Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press.

Green, E. C. (2005). Gendering the city, gendering the welfare state: The Nurses' Settlement of Richmond 1900-1930. *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, 113*(3), 277-311.

Hamburger, S. (1999). We take care of our womenfolk: The Home for Needy Confederate Women in Richmond, Virginia 1898-1990. In E. C. Green (Ed.), *Before the New Deal: Social Welfare in the South 1830-1930* (pp. 61-77). Athens: The University of Georgia Press.

Lebsock, S. (1984). *The free women of Petersburg: Status and culture in a southern town, 1784-1860.* New York: W. W. Norton and Company.

Lejano, R. P. (2006). *Frameworks for policy analysis: Merging text and context.* New York: Routledge.

Linde, C. (2009). *Working the past: Narrative and institutional memory.* New York: Oxford University Press.

McCarthy, K. D. (1982). *Noblesse oblige: Charity and cultural philanthropy in Chicago 1849-1929.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

McCarthy, K. D. (Ed.). (1990). *Lady bountiful revisited: Women, philanthropy, and power.* New Burnwick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

McCarthy, K. D. (2003). *American creed: Philanthropy and the rise of civil society 1700-1865.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Netting, F. E., & O'Connor, M. K. (2005). Lady boards of managers: Subjugated legacies of governance & administration. *Affilia, 20*(4), 448-464.

Netting, F. E., O'Connor, M. K., & Fauri, D. P. (2009). A missing tradition: Women managing charitable organizations in Richmond, Virginia, 1805-1900. *Social Service Review, 83*(4), 558-584.

Protestant Episcopal Church Home (PECH), Board of Corporators (BoC). (1875-1989). *Minute books.* Protestant Episcopal Church Home Records, series 1, box 1, call no. Mss 3 P9464b1. Virginia Historical Society, Richmond.

Protestant Episcopal Church Home (PECH), Lady Board of Managers (LB). (1875-1976). *Minute books.* Protestant Episcopal Church Home Records, series 1, box 1, vol. 1, call no. Mss 3 P9464a FAI. Virginia Historical Society, Richmond.

Richmond Male Orphan Asylum (RMOA), Board of Managers. (1870-1997). *Minute book.* Virginia Home for Boys Records, sec 1, box 1, call no. Mss3 V81954 a, Virginia Historical Society, Richmond.

Rogers, G. W. (1956). Richmond Home for Boys—110 Years of Service to the Community. *Richmond News-Leader*, July 17. Richmond Home for Boys records, newspaper clipping, Valentine Richmond History Center, Richmond, VA.

Scott, A. F. (1970). *The southern lady: From pedestal to politics 1830-1930.* Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.

Scott, A. F.(1993). *Natural allies: Women's associations in American history*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Skocpol, T. (1992). *Protecting soldiers and mothers*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Treadway, S. G. (1995). *Women of mark: A history of the woman's club of Richmond, Virginia 1894-1994*. Richmond: The Library of Virginia.

Varon, E. R. (1998). *We mean to be counted: White women and politics in antebellum Virginia*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.